

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please accept the replacement sheet with new drawing Figures 2A, 2B, 2C.

Please accept the amendment of drawing Figure 2 in the replacement sheet.

REMARKS

The above noted Office Action and the references cited therein have been carefully considered and, in view of the amendments herein to the claims and the following representations, reconsideration of the application in its present form is respectfully requested.

Concerning the objection to the drawing, Applicant notes that Figure 2 already shows by surface shading the concave surface. However, to clarify, a replacement drawing sheet is enclosed, with Figure 2A being added, showing a crosssectional view along the viewing arrow lines "2A-2A" added to Figure 2.

The specification has also been amended to recite new Figure 2A, as well as new Figures 2B and 2C regarding the foldable mirror surface version.

Concerning the Claims, Claims 9 and 20 are canceled. Claims 15-19 were previously withdrawn as directed to a non-elected species.

With respect to the prior art rejection based upon US Patent Number 5,424,875 of Davis, Claim 1 is amended to reflect that the mirror apparatus is mounted by license plate fastener screws to the license plate bracket of the vehicle. While the cited US Patent Number 6,489,927 of LeBlanc states that the radar device described therein can be attached to "a bumper section or other vehicle body part, for example, a lamp housing, a body panel, a license plate, or a side mirror housing", the mounting brackets 20 are described as being mounted directly to a body part, thus implying an adhesive or other surface to surface contact means. LeBlanc '927 does not suggest utilizing the holes and fastener screws of a license plate bracket holder.

In view of the amendment herein, it is respectfully submitted that the claims more particularly point out distinctly claim the method of the present invention.

With respect to the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) or 35 USC 103, in view of the amendments herein to Claims 1 and 10, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims should be now withdrawn.

Simply using the surface of a license plate, as in LeBlanc, whether similar or not, would therefor not provide any expectation of success, unless such attachment were thoroughly evaluated.

In fact, the surface-to-surface attachments in connection with LeBlanc would teach away from the likelihood of success of using a license plate bracket and fastener mounting screws, thereby not defacing the visual indicia of the license plate, or at most offer an invitation to experiment, which is not the basis under the law for a claim of obviousness.

The use of the license plate bracket and fastening screws in the present invention for attaching the mirror device would be discouraged, if not clearly taught away from attaching it directly to a surface of a license plate.

Thus, the position of the Examiner that the use of a license plate, as in LeBlanc, in conjunction with the mirror of Davis, is not only not suggested, but would be discouraged or taught away by the references relied on.

Therefore, the rejection of under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that the application is in condition
for allowance, which allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 8, 2005

Alfred M. Walker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 29,983

225 Old Country Road
Melville, NY 11747-2712
(516) 361-8737
pat4